

THE REMONSTRANCE

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, JULY, 1917

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other Publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and forty-six Branch Committees; 40,180* members in 443 cities, towns, and villages

MRS. STEPHEN S. FITZGERALD, President	
MRS. THOMAS ALLEN, Acting Vice-President	
MRS. BENJAMIN A. NORTON	
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ	
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY	
MISS ANNA L. DAVES	
MRS. LOUIS A. FROTHINGHAM	Vice-Presidents
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD	
MRS. CURTIS GUILD	
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL	
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL	
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY	
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer	

Walnut Street, Brookline

Education and Organization Committee

Chairman

MRS. WM. LOWELL PUTNAM

Publicity Committee

Chairman

MRS. HENRY PRESTON WHITE

Branch Organization

Chairman

MRS. THOMAS NELSON PERKINS

Membership Committee

Chairman

MISS JULIA C. FRENDEGAST

Meetings Committee

Chairman

MRS. HAROLD MURDOCK

Public Interest League

President

MRS. B. L. ROBINSON

College Anti-Suffrage League

President

MRS. HERBERT LYMAN

Recording Secretary

MRS. RANDOLPH FROTHINGHAM

Corresponding Secretary

MRS. A. H. PARKER

* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State

MEMBERS ARE EARNESTLY REQUESTED TO KEEP HEADQUARTERS ADVISED OF CHANGES OF ADDRESS.

AMERICA FIRST—AND ALWAYS

THIS is the motto of anti-suffragists. During the great struggle into which the United States has been forced, they will give the first place, in their thoughts and activities, to their country. In every possible way, through their own organizations, through the National League for Woman's Service, through the Red Cross, through other organizations and individually, they will contribute unsparingly to the triumph of the national cause and the supplying of the national needs. The promises of service which they have made to the President of the United States, to the Governors of the several states and to municipal authorities will be kept, in spirit and in letter.

It is deplorable that the suffragists are not pursuing a similar course. In this time of national stress, when the country is involved in the greatest war in the history of the world, they might well have declared a truce in their agitation. Even the Pankhursts, in England, did this after a fashion, and have kept it, to some extent. But American suffragists hold to their slogan, "Suffrage First"; and, at a time when Congress is beset with urgent war questions and the attention of the country is concentrated upon the needs of the hour, they persist in pressing their issue more strenuously than ever. The temper in which they are doing this is indicated in this declaration which their National President, Mrs. Catt, made before the Senate Committee at Washington, on the 20th of April:

"Today we stand upon the verge of what may prove the greatest test of endurance yet put upon our Republic. Women, the greatest force our nation possesses for the creation of public sentiment, are asked to mobilize their forces in aid of a government which has wronged them."

No one has empowered Mrs. Catt to speak for the women of the United States. She represents only a small minority of them. The great majority of American women are taking up their new duties not grudgingly, not with a sense that the Government has "wronged" them, but enthusiastically, and with the feeling that it is the best Government on the face of the earth, and that they owe to it most of the things that make life worth living.

Because they believe that the suffrage movement is a more serious menace than ever under present conditions, anti-suffragists regard it as a patriotic duty, and, in a large sense, a measure of national defense, to oppose it with all their strength. But they will not allow this duty to interfere in any way with their cardinal principle—"America first—and always."

"VOTES FOR WOMEN" SHIRTS

It is a well-known fact that English suffragists, in whatever work they have done for soldiers, in the hospitals and elsewhere, have used every opportunity to carry along their propaganda among the men to whose needs they ministered. Apparently, American suffragists have the same intention. At Elizabeth, N. J., last month, the Red Cross chapter, on looking over a supply of shirts, offered by the suffragists for wounded soldiers in hospitals, found that the words "Votes for Women" were stitched on the pocket of each shirt. The Red Cross chapter very properly refused to accept the garments thus marked, and the suffragists took them back with the declaration that their "identity could not be lost." The incident throws a strong light upon the real motive of suffragist war activities.

THE ANNUAL MEETING

THE annual meeting of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts was held at the Hotel Lenox on the 26th of April. There was a large attendance, both at the morning conference and at the afternoon session. Mrs. John Balch of Milton presided.

In her opening address at the morning conference, Mrs. Balch directed attention to the vote of the Colorado Legislature against the resolution of the Woman's Party for the Susan B. Anthony amendment. Mrs. Daniel Markham, President of the Connecticut Association, reported an anti-suffrage victory in her state. Only 4 per cent. of the women want the vote, she said. The suffragists in Connecticut are just a little band making a fuss. Mrs. A. T. Dudley, President of the New Hampshire Association, urged the continuance of anti-suffrage work as a patriotic duty. Mrs. H. R. Virgin, reporting for the Maine Association, spoke of the campaign in that state, where a suffrage amendment is to be submitted to the voters at a special election on the 10th of September, and asked the assistance of Massachusetts women. She emphasized the importance of the election, and hoped to have tales of success to report later. Mrs. Charles Wayman of New York, formerly Miss Dorothy Godfrey, state organizer for Massachusetts, urged the duty of patriotic service.

At the afternoon session, Mrs. Stephen S. Fitzgerald was elected President, to succeed Mrs. Balch, whose term had expired, and who declined a renomination. The other officers elected were Mrs. George R. Agassiz, Mrs. Thomas Allen, Mrs. Robert S. Bradley, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Curtis Guild, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Benjamin A. Norton, Mrs. Robert S. Russell, and Mrs. Henry M. Whitney, Vice-Presidents; Mrs. James M. Codman, Treasurer; Mrs. Randolph

Frothingham, Recording Secretary; Mrs. A. H. Parker, Corresponding Secretary; and Mrs. John Balch, Miss Louise Brown, Mrs. James D. Colt, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Mrs. John F. Hill, Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Mrs. Herbert Lyman, Mrs. Harold Murdock, Mrs. Thomas Nelson Perkins, Miss Julia C. Prendergast, Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, Mrs. B. L. Robinson, Miss Evelyn Sears, Mrs. William P. Shreve, Miss Elizabeth P. Sohier, Miss Ellen Tower, Mrs. Rudolph Weld, Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Mrs. Henry Preston White, and Mrs. J. Bertram Williams, and the officers, Executive Committee.

Mrs. A. J. George presented a resolution favoring prohibition as an economic measure in war time, which was unanimously adopted, and copies ordered to be sent to President Wilson and to the Governors of the New England States.

The report of the Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, who was unable to be present, was read by Mrs. A. H. Parker. Mrs. Balch read the report of the Education and Organization Committee, of which Mrs. William Lowell Putnam is chairman. It showed a distribution of 321,372 pieces of literature during the year, and material for 250 debates on the suffrage amendment. Mrs. B. L. Robinson reported for the Public Interests League; Miss Julia C. Prendergast for the Membership Committee; Mrs. Henry Preston White for the Publicity Committee; Mrs. Thomas Nelson Perkins for the Branch Organization Committee; and Mrs. Thomas Allen for the College Anti-Suffrage League.

Mrs. A. J. George gave the closing address of the session. She declared that, while the suffragists are singing, "I did not raise my boy to be a soldier," anti-suffrage mothers are placing their hands on their boys' shoulders and saying, "Go and serve your country." She assailed the suffrage policy of placing their cause first and their country second, and predicted

that, when the war was over, they would point to whatever service they had rendered in Red Cross and other work, and say, "Because we have done this, we must have the vote." She declared that anti-suffragists would do their war-work as well and efficiently as their husbands and brothers, and, when the war was over, it would be shown that they were the ones who had borne the heat and burden of the day, and not those who were trying to spread a special propaganda. The women of this country, she said, do not want political power, but moral influence, and they are working as patriots for the nation.

WOMEN AND "PEOPLE"

THAT ardent suffragist Senator, who sought an opinion from the Massachusetts Supreme Court on the meaning of the word "people," in the hope that it might open the way to allowing women to vote on the amendments which may be submitted by the Constitutional Convention, deserves the thanks of anti-suffragists, for he was the means of securing from the Court an illuminating opinion, which puts an end to this absurd suffragist quibble.

The decision of the Court is that the word "people," when used in a political signification, means "that part of the entire body of inhabitants who, under the Constitution, are intrusted with the exercise of the sovereign power and the conduct of the government. The 'people' in the Constitution in a practical sense means those who, under the existing Constitution, *possess the right to exercise elective franchise, and who, while that instrument remains in force unchanged, will be the sole organs through which the will of the body politic can be expressed.*"

It was unreasonable that the time of the Supreme Court should be taken up in defining a point so obvious, but, since the question was submitted, it is gratifying to have the answer so conclusive.

MARRIED MEN FOR WAR

MISS RANKIN, the Montana Congresswoman, who gained a conspicuous place in the headlines by her sobbing vote against war, has her own ideas as to how war, when it must come, should be carried on.

The old principle is "Old men for counsel, young men for war." Miss Rankin would reverse this. She would send the fathers of families to war, because they have already done their duty in domestic relations, but she would exempt "the young men who have not as yet selected their life-mates" and become fathers of children.

The effect of this plan upon military efficiency is something which Miss Rankin does not think it necessary to take into consideration. Nothing would contribute more surely to the triumph of the enemy than sending out armies of the aged and middle-aged to face the German armies. But that, again, does not matter to Miss Rankin. The Lowell Courier-Citizen of April 28, is abundantly justified in its sharp comment:

"Miss Rankin's successive exhibitions do not tend to make us much more enthusiastic toward the prospect of a House and Senate made up, on the 50-50 basis, of anxious ladies and mediocre gentlemen. Superficial conversations would indicate that her career thus far has landed the suffrage cause the most decided wallop that it has sustained in a decade. We can do with very, very few of these feminist representatives, if the present sample is to be taken as indicating the general trend."

IN CONNECTICUT

THE suffragists should not allow themselves to be unduly exuberant over the favorable action taken in the Connecticut Legislature upon the resolution for the submission of a suffrage amendment.

The provisions for amending the constitution of Connecticut are peculiar in this respect, that, while the resolution for submission must pass two legislatures, all that is required

the first year is a majority vote in the House, while the second year it must receive a two-thirds vote in both branches. The vote in the House on the 8th day of May was 136 to 96—a vote which would not have been sufficient to meet the requirements of the second year, to say nothing of the added requirement of a two-thirds vote in the other branch.

The Connecticut suffragists had been trying in vain to induce the Legislature to pass a presidential and municipal suffrage bill, and The Woman's Journal of May 12 admitted that "the success of the suffrage amendment was partly due to a feeling on the part of the men that the suffragists did not want a referendum—that they were afraid of it." That was precisely the reason which led the suffragists openly to oppose a suffrage amendment in Ohio and Illinois.

AFRAID OF THE VOTERS

IN Michigan, the same Legislature which passed the Damon bill giving women the right to vote for presidential electors, passed also, and by a two-thirds vote in both branches, the Flowers resolution, which provides for the submission of a suffrage amendment to the state constitution in 1918.

The suffragists are delighted with the action on presidential suffrage, and have promptly added Michigan to their suffrage map, and the entire female population of the state to their totals of possible women voters at the next presidential election.

But they regard the proposed vote on a suffrage amendment as a hostile movement. They base their opposition on three grounds: the difficulty of raising funds for an adequate campaign; the fact that the national suffrage bodies wish to concentrate all efforts on a Federal amendment; and the absence of a complete union among the Michigan suffragists. They have shown their ignorance of elementary principles of government by pouring in appeals to Governor

Sleeper to veto the resolution, when they should have known that such a resolution, approved by a two-thirds vote of both houses, does not go to the Governor for approval and cannot be vetoed by him.

These frenzied demonstrations of the Michigan suffragists furnish proof that they do not dare to take their cause to the qualified voters of the state. In Michigan, as in Ohio, suffrage amendments have twice been defeated at the polls during the last five years,—the second time by greatly increased majorities. If the suffragists imagined that they had the ghost of a chance of securing full suffrage at the polls, they would welcome enthusiastically these new opportunities instead of deploring and opposing them. In both states, there is a practical certainty that, before 1920, both amendments will be heavily defeated, and both presidential suffrage bills thrown into the discard.

NORTH DAKOTA WOMEN

WHATEVER reasons may have prompted the North Dakota legislature this year to pass a bill giving women Presidential and municipal suffrage, and also to submit again to the voters the suffrage constitutional amendment which was defeated at the polls in 1914 by a majority of 9,659, the zeal which North Dakota women have shown in using the voting privileges which they already had cannot have been one of them.

The women of that state have had the school vote for twenty-eight years, but not more than 2 or 3 per cent. of the women entitled to vote have taken the trouble to do so. In June, 1914, in Grand Forks county, 2,800 men voted, and 95 women; in Cass county, 3,598 men, and 31 women, in Walsh county, 2,000 men and 65 women; in Nelson county, 1,404 men and 73 women; in Pembina county, 2,154 men and 97 women; and in Towner county 1,885 men and 15 women. In 1909, at the election for state superintendent of public instruction, only 2,015 women in the whole state voted, as compared with 96,737 men.

A GOVERNMENT BY WOMEN

THE condition which Great Britain will have to confront, if Parliament should be so ill advised as to act favorably upon the recommendation of a majority of the Speaker's Conference for partial woman suffrage, is that of a government controlled by women.

Three years ago, Mr. Asquith stated the case plainly: "I have always said if you are going to give the franchise to women you must give it on the same terms as to men." Presumably, he is of the same opinion still. Whether he is or not, the seasoned suffragists are. The "Suffragette News" describes the report of the Speaker's Conference as "a present defeat in our struggle for equality," but adds cheerfully: "However, it will serve us to work for an early extension of the vote, a work which will be encouraged and lightened by the help of six million women with political power."

This extension of the vote would be practically inevitable if Parliament were to make the concession recommended by the majority of the Speaker's Conference. There is no logical reason for fixing the voting age of women at thirty or thirty-five, when the voting age of men is twenty-one. The only assignable motive for it is a wish to keep down the proportions of the new electorate, and that could not long prevail with six million women given full powers.

If Parliament accepts the recommendations of the Speaker's Conference, so far as men are concerned, there will be 10,804,334 male electors. If women are admitted to the ballot on the same basis as men, there will be 12,044,567 female electors. This means that, on all questions on which women, as a group, differed from men, as a group, it would be the feminine view which would predominate and, for all practical purposes, Great Britain would be under a government of women. What that might mean, in a time of national stress and

struggle, may be guessed. But members of Parliament cannot afford to shut their eyes to the fact that every vote for the limited suffrage now under consideration is a vote to hasten that result.

THE SUFFRAGE ISSUE IN OHIO

WRITING in the *Brooklyn Eagle*, Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, Chairman of the National Suffrage Press Association, states that "the enemies in Ohio have secured the submission of an amendment to the State constitution, and hope by that means to get rid of the recent law." Mrs. Harper adds:

"It is surprising that the opponents should be so hostile to the idea of women voting merely for President of the United States that they would be willing to submit the State to the expense of an election in order to defeat a constitutional amendment for the third time."

This solicitude in suffrage quarters about "the expense of an election" is something new. New York, in November, 1915, defeated a suffrage amendment by a majority of 195,000; but this did not prevent the suffragists, two months later, from introducing in the Legislature another resolution for the submission of a constitutional amendment. This means an expense of a million dollars, more or less, but the suffrage leaders paid no regard to that. Untaught by their experience in Michigan and Ohio, they hope, by repeated attempts, to persuade the New York electorate to reverse its verdict. So experienced a leader as Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch has warned them that "another referendum would only bring a worse defeat than the recent one," but they are going ahead notwithstanding, and the public must pay the cost.

Why is it that the suffragists do not record the submission of a constitutional amendment in Ohio among the "suffrage victories" of 1917? Could there be any plainer acknowledgment of the fact that the enact-

ment of a Presidential suffrage bill in that state was in direct defiance of an overwhelming public sentiment, which was expressed at the polls in 1914 by a majority of 188,905 against a suffrage amendment?

The Ohio Presidential suffrage bill cannot become operative, in any case, before 1920. Long before that date it will be wiped off the statute book; and any attempt to re-enact it—to which Mrs. Harper looks forward hopefully—will be treated as it deserves.

LIMITED VICTORIES

SUFFRAGISTS who are inclined to exaggerate the scope and importance of recent successes in the legislatures are reminded by Ida Husted Harper, chairman of the Suffrage National Press Committee, in a letter in the *New York Evening Post* of April 25, that in no state have women been given full suffrage this year, or last year or the year preceding. In not one of the eight states in which women have been given a partial franchise, Mrs. Harper goes on to say, can they vote for members of the legislature, for any state officials or for members of either house of Congress. Moreover, in three of the states whose legislatures have voted for partial suffrage this year—North Dakota, Ohio and Arkansas—the question is going to the voters on referendums; and in a fourth, Indiana, the validity of the law is to be taken to the Supreme Court.

THE *Woman's Journal*, the oldest and for a long time the only woman suffrage organ in this country, passed out of existence on the 2d of June, being merged—together with the *Woman Voter* and the *National Suffrage News*—in the new organ, *The Woman Citizen*. The *Woman's Journal's* swan song took the form of an urgent appeal, in letters to its subscribers, for a contribution of \$10,000, in order that it might go into the merger "with its debts all paid."

A ONE-SIDED TRUCE

THE New York World (suffragist) defines as follows the duty of anti-suffrage women:

"This is no time for women to wrangle among themselves as to whether they should have the vote, or to make their service to their country depend on political considerations. They are all Americans and they should be wholly American in their patriotism. But does not the duty of composing these differences rest on the women who are opposed to other women voting?"

As they made themselves responsible for the partisan quarrel among women, should they not gracefully take the first steps toward a truce and a union of feminist interests for the common good?"

The World must know, or, if it does not, it should, that anti-suffrage women did take "the first steps toward a truce," and, through their National President, offered to suspend their activities if the suffragists would do the same. But, so far from accepting this offer, the suffragists are doubling their exertions both in Congress and in the legislatures. The World's suggestion, therefore, amounts to this, that anti-suffrage women ought to surrender their principles, and allow the suffrage women, who represent only a small minority of their sex, to have their own way. One of them writes ingenuously in the Springfield Republican of April 23: "The suffragists of Massachusetts would, I am sure, rejoice if those 'opposed' would give up their opposition during the present crisis in our country."

Doubtless they would rejoice, because that would give them a chance to get, in time of war, at whatever cost to the general good, and to the desires of the great majority of women, what they have found it impossible to get in time of peace. The suffragist program was definitely outlined in the Boston Post of April 15, by Miss Katherine Morey, state treasurer of the National Woman's Party, in these words:

"There are plenty of women's or-

ganizations doing all kinds of stunts for war, and it is not the purpose of the National Woman's Party to depart from their original purpose. We will draw up no resolutions backing up the President because we believe that now is the time of times to smash our great democratic issue through."

When the suffragists thus proclaim their purpose to make use of the national emergency as "the time of times to smash through" their program, it is asking too much of conscientious anti-suffrage women to entreat them to keep out of the way.

WOMEN VOTERS

LAST year, the Congressional Union professed to believe that there were four million women voters entitled to vote at the Presidential election. This year, the estimate is doubled.

The 1916 estimate should have been cut down more than one-half. This, on so good a suffrage authority as Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, President of the National Woman Suffrage Association, who, speaking at the Congressional Conference of the Woman Suffrage Party in New York, Feb. 24, 1916, said:

"There never were four million women voters in the western suffrage states. The total number of women is only 3,700,000. Two-thirds of the men in other states are eligible to vote, and it is only proper to suppose that the same proposition holds true of women. That makes about 2,300,000 on the voting list, and only 80 per cent. of these can be counted on to go to the polls and vote. That brings the four million down to less than two."

The same process of reasoning would bring the present estimate down to less than four million. And even that figure includes states where the recent legislation is likely to be overthrown by judicial decisions or by popular referendums long before the next Presidential election.

DR. JOSEPH SILVERMAN, President of the Eastern Council of Reform Rabbis, addressing the Council at New York on the 24th of April, char-

acterized the pending suffrage campaign in that state very truthfully when he said:

"It is almost criminal to waste our time and energy in the next few months on a useless debate on suffrage when we should be turning our whole attention to mobilizing our forces for defence against the foe."

HOW PICKETING HURTS THE SUFFRAGE CAUSE

(David Lawrence, Washington correspondent of the New York Evening Post (suffragist) May 7, 1917)

Until the woman suffragettes, or at least those who are directing the campaign for the enfranchisement of women, realize that today their cause is being injured here instead of helped by quasi-militant tactics, and that mere man, endowed with executive or Congressional power, must be appealed to by methods of reason instead of quasi-violence, the advocates of a Federal Amendment in Congress may as well make up their minds that so far as this Administration is concerned—and it lasts until 1920—the effort to coerce President Wilson or Congress is doomed to failure. This is said apropos of the woman pickets who still nag the President every day with their "silent sentinels" and yellow flags.

The evidence, so far as this correspondent can discover it by talks with people in Congress, in the Government and out of it, leads to the conclusion that the cause of suffrage will never be advanced by nagging tactics. Picketing hurts, not because only a dozen women are doing it, while millions are performing patriotic service; picketing hurts because it puts an emphasis on the stubborn desire of woman for political rights at a time when many people are struggling with might and main to preserve from demolition political rights won by previous centuries of toil.

The suffragettes might as well set down as wasted their picketing of the next three years in front of the White House. As for trying to influence Congress, that isn't so far afield, for suffrage is always pending in some form there. But picketing cannot be said to have created a real sympathy for suffrage; and a public sympathy for it is absolutely necessary before votes for a Federal amendment can be marshaled in sufficient numbers to permit of its submission to the States—a long and tedious process.

A DEVICE THAT DID NOT WORK

WHEN Mrs. Norman De R. Whitehouse, chairman of the New York State Suffrage Party, offered Adjutant General Stotesbury the services of an alleged 500,000 suffrage workers to make a house-to-house canvass of the state for the military census, she probably saw a great opportunity to carry on a state-wide propaganda for the pending constitutional amendment under the guise of a patriotic activity.

But General Stotesbury was not so easily beguiled. He replied that the work could not be entrusted to a single political party, but that the responsibility must rest on military officials. They will accept the proffered free aid of all the political parties, social and civic organizations, and individuals unaffiliated with any political organization. General Stotesbury does not approve of the method of a house-to-house canvass; but regards Governor Whitman's scheme for the organization of county committees to do the field work through enrolment depots as more efficient. He will be able to use suffrage party members and other volunteers at these depots, but the work must be done under military discipline and in conformity with the general regulations.

For this sensible decision, General Stotesbury has made himself the target for suffragist abuse, but he probably will be able to bear up under it. The main thing is that the state has been spared the discreditable spectacle of a party organization turning the national emergency to political account.

MALIGNING THE VOTERS

SPEAKING before the United States Senate Suffrage Committee on the 20th of April, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, President of the National American Suffrage Association, explained recent suffrage defeats at the polls as follows:

"The defeat was definitely traceable to the foreign vote, organized

under the direction of unscrupulous native-born. . . . Illiterate men signing their names with a mark, ignorant men without understanding, foreign men who could not speak English, drunken men with minds blurred, half-witted men, degenerate men, and every other type which makes up the underworld, were marshalled to the polls."

This is Mrs. Catt's explanation of the overwhelming suffrage defeat in West Virginia, where the proposed suffrage amendment was rejected at the polls by a majority of more than 98,000, and of similar defeats in Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan, New York, and other states. Always it is the bad elements in the community which pile up the hostile majorities.

Is it possible that Mrs. Catt imagines that the suffrage cause is promoted by such reckless charges against the majority of male voters? Dr. Shaw, Mrs. Catt's predecessor in office, distinguished herself by the declaration that "Senator Grady and men like him, bearing foreign names," should not have the right to vote upon woman suffrage; and now Mrs. Catt goes further with this wholesale insult to the American electorate, adding to it a denunciation of "the denial of the vote to half our people by piratical, submarine methods." This is her description of the submission of the suffrage question to the free and deliberate judgment of American voters; but she sees nothing "submarine" or "piratical" in trying to secure the vote by stealthy lobbies and individual pressure upon legislators and over the heads of the voters.

THE QUESTION IN ILLINOIS

ILLINOIS legislators were confronted this year by a curious situation. They had before them a resolution for the submission of a suffrage amendment to the constitution, which was warmly supported by one organization of suffragists and vehemently opposed by another; and they had also a resolution providing

for the holding of a constitutional convention, the passage of which was urged by the suffragists who opposed the suffrage amendment. The legislators selected the path of least resistance, and passed the convention resolution.

It was the Illinois Suffrage Amendment Alliance which stood sponsor for the suffrage amendment; and it was the Illinois Equal Suffrage Association which opposed it.

Under the constitution of Illinois, any proposed amendment must receive not only a majority of all the votes cast on the proposition, but a majority of all the votes cast at the election at which it is submitted. The Equal Suffrage Association based its opposition to the amendment resolution on this fact. But precisely the same requirement applies to the resolution for holding a constitutional convention, which the Association supported.

The amendment resolution would have given the voters of Illinois a chance to vote upon full suffrage for women in November, 1918. But, under the bill which the Equal Suffrage Association supported, the question cannot go to the voters before 1921. No provision can be made for the election of members of the convention until the legislative session of 1919, and 1921 is the earliest year in which the result of the convention's work can be submitted to the voters.

What the Illinois Equal Suffrage Association therefore actually labored for was a postponement for at least three years of any referendum to the voters. And they did this so strenuously that Mrs. Grace Wilbur Trout, their President, repeatedly declared that an earlier submission of the question would be "fatal."

What is this but an admission that the existing suffrage law, foisted upon the State, as it was, without consulting the voters, has worked so ill that the electorate would be certain to defeat suffrage at the polls at the first opportunity?

THE INDIANA SUFFRAGE BILL

THERE are grave doubts as to the constitutionality of the suffrage bill passed by the Indiana Legislature.

This bill went farther than that which was lobbied through the Illinois Legislature four years ago, in that it not only gave to women presidential and municipal suffrage, but allowed them to vote at primary elections, and for delegates to the approaching constitutional convention, and upon whatever propositions may be submitted by the convention.

The validity of the bill is questioned on two grounds. The first is that it carries with it a discrimination as to naturalization. Indiana allows foreign-born men to vote who have merely declared their intention of becoming citizens. But, under the suffrage bill, foreign-born women cannot vote unless they are actually naturalized.

A more serious ground for attacking the constitutionality of the bill is this clause in the State Constitution:

"In all elections not otherwise provided for in this constitution, *every male citizen of the United States* . . . shall be entitled to vote in the township or precinct where he may reside."

That seems reasonably plain—as plain as the similar provision in the Constitution of North Dakota, which the Legislature of that state has attempted to override by a simple enactment. Already the Indiana suffragists are going far afield for arguments to sustain the validity of the bill—their leading proposition being that primary elections, municipal and school elections, elections for delegates to the constitutional convention, and elections at which propositions are submitted to the people, "are not elections under the provision of the Constitution."

That is a point which is hardly likely to bear a judicial scrutiny. Miss Blackwell, in *The Woman's Journal* of May 19, remarked that the decision upon these points "will probably depend on whether the majority of the Justices of the Indiana Supreme

Court are broad-minded or reactionary." But, even at the risk of being assailed as "reactionary," the Indiana Justices might well feel it necessary to rule that elections are elections, and that, when the Constitution says "male citizens" it means male citizens.

Delegates to the constitutional convention in Indiana will be elected on the 19th of September; and it is extremely likely that, before that date, the suffrage bill will be pronounced invalid.

"FOR ADVERTISING PURPOSES"

THERE seems to be ground for the suspicion that one motive back of the recent riotous demonstrations of the Woman's Party suffragettes at Washington was to get advertising and gather in funds.

On the 15th of June, the Woman's Party sent out a confidential appeal to its supporters, expressing "deep anxiety over our financial situation." "We are the only suffrage group," the statement went on, "working on Congress that has not been turned aside by the war, but is still, as an organization, putting all its effort into the suffrage movement." But the income of the organization, it appears, was over \$5,000 less than in February, and over \$6,000 less than in January. "We are most anxious," wrote Miss Alice Paul, the National Chairman, in this personally-signed appeal, "to carry on the best campaign of which we are capable, in the hope of securing the passage of the amendment before this Congress is over. We cannot do so—indeed, we shall have greatly to diminish, if not altogether to suspend, our activities—unless we can raise several thousand dollars very soon."

It was on the 15th that this appeal went out. It was on the 20th, only five days later, that the new militant campaign was begun. Was this only a coincidence?

MRS. IDA HUSTED HARPER, Chairman of the National Suffrage Press Committee, in a letter published in the *Worcester Gazette* of May 3, pre-

dicts that Massachusetts "will not grant the franchise to women until compelled to do so by a Federal amendment." For once, Mrs. Harper is a true prophet. And, as few things are less likely than Congressional sanction of a Federal amendment by a two-thirds vote of both branches, and its ratification by thirty-six states, Massachusetts suffragists have little to hope for.

THE New York Evening Post (suffragist), commenting editorially in its issue for May 12 upon the I. W. W. trial at Everett, Washington, and the Mooney case at San Francisco, said:

"It is a puzzle to us of the enslaved East that in the progressive States of the Pacific Coast, where so much pioneer work has been done towards the upbuilding of industrial justice, there should be frequently recurring crises involving guerrilla warfare with rifle and bomb, the suppression of free speech and the misuse of the courts."

The Post must have forgotten for the moment that both of the States which it mentioned, as well as Colorado, where this sort of violence was carried to such extremes three years ago that Federal troops had to be sent to restrain it, are enjoying the uplifting and purifying influence of "votes for women."

APROPPOS of the National Woman's Party picketing of the White House, The Boston Herald of May 26th very justly said: "The opponents of woman suffrage have not in many a day found such substantial evidence of the unfitness of some women for the ballot as in the presence, in this time of war and violence and disorder, of a group of feminine stimulators of disorder ceaselessly picketing the gates of the White House." That is perfectly true. As an object lesson of suffrage aims and methods, of the recklessness of suffrage leaders, and of the drift toward lawlessness of the present suffrage movement, the White House picketers are an invaluable aid to the anti-suffrage cause.

THE PUBLIC INTERESTS LEAGUE

THE Public Interests League of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts held its annual meeting at 685 Washington Street, Boston, May 22d.

Mrs. B. L. Robinson, President of the League, outlined some of the war aid work planned for the coming year, and read letters from one of the French orphans whom members of the League have adopted.

A large silk flag was presented by the League to Dr. E. H. Nichols, representing Base Hospital Unit 7, which is to be sent to the French front by the Boston City Hospital when orders are received from the War Department. In presenting the flag, Mrs. Robinson paid a tribute to the great sacrifices for humanity which had been made by doctors and surgeons, and to their noble services on nearly every battlefield during the war. Boston doctors, she said, had been leaders in this crusade of mercy, and she emphasized in particular the fight against typhus in Serbia, headed by Dr. Strong, and won against fearful odds—a thrilling chapter in the history of what science can do when it wishes to heal, not to hurt. Unit after unit has gone to carry life and hope to men wounded in battle; and, as France is the great battlefield, most of them have gone to France.

Lieut. Giraudaux, one of the six French officers now teaching the Harvard Regiment the military tactics employed in modern warfare, spoke briefly in French, paying a tribute to the work of American doctors on French battlefields, and appealing earnestly for further help for the French cause.

Mrs. Robinson and Mrs. Stephen S. Fitzgerald, President of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association, urged liberal subscriptions to the "Liberty Loan."

The following officers were elected: President, Mrs. B. L. Robinson; Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Frank B. San-

born and Mrs. Edwin Ford; Treasurer, Miss Evelyn Sears; Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles B. Gulick; Recording Secretary, Miss Adelaide Proctor.

PAY IN ADVANCE

AMERICAN suffragists are striking a curious note in insisting upon the adoption of the Federal suffrage amendment as "a war measure."

About the last thing which an intelligent statesman would wish to do, when his country was plunged into a world-wide war, would be to disturb the existing foundations of government. He would feel it a matter of superlative importance to concentrate all the national forces upon the new emergency, and to refrain from all unnecessary experiments in domestic affairs.

But the suffragists go further even than to insist upon suffrage as a war measure. They push their claim unblushingly on the ground that the women of the United States are about to render great services and to make great sacrifices, and that they ought to have the vote as a reward. But what they are insisting upon is payment for such services and sacrifices, not after they are rendered, but in advance. And the absurdity of their claim is intensified by the fact that the great majority of American women have not asked for the vote and do not want it. The suffrage claim, therefore, practically is that, in payment for services which suffrage women profess their intention to render, the great majority of American women shall be penalized by having thrust upon them a burden from which they shrink.

Nor is this all. Dr. Anna Howard Shaw and other suffrage leaders are stipulating that, for whatever measure of men's work women may be called upon to do, because of the absence of men upon military or naval service, they shall receive equal pay with men. This, in spite of the obvious fact that, in most of these forms

of work, women, by the limitations of their sex, cannot do equal work.

Altogether, this is rather a grudging type of patriotism.

TWO TYPES OF SUFFRAGISTS

MRS. CATT, speaking before the Mississippi Valley "Victory" Conference at Columbus, Ohio, on the 13th of May, repeated the statement which she made before the Senate Committee at Washington, that American women are "asked to mobilize their forces in aid of a government which has wronged them"; and added: "We have been patient, infinitely patient, but we grow rebellious."

Commenting on these statements, Mrs. W. H. Wait, Michigan State Regent of the Daughters of the Revolution, herself an ardent suffragist, said, in the Detroit Free Press of May 15:

"The heroic sacrifice and valued services in war time of the noble women of France, England, Italy and the other Allies do not seem to have been crippled because they did not have the franchise. This is no time to be emphasizing a grievance of any kind. It is a time when we, as women, should stand whole-heartedly by the government, doing our bit for the flag, purchased by the blood, toil and sacrifice of American men and women who have made us a nation."

Which is the truer type of patriot, the national suffrage leader who seizes the occasion of the entrance of her country into the great war to declare that she and her associates are "growing rebellious," or the Michigan suffragist who urges all American women to "stand whole-heartedly by the government" and to refrain from emphasizing any grievance?

ONE of the tokens of friendship and appreciation which Marshal Joffre took back with him to France was a brooch for Mme. Joffre, the gift of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. The brooch was of enamel, set in silver, and it represented the first American flag of independence, with thirteen stars.